

REMARKS

Applicant is amending the claims of the present application, as explained below, to clarify the claimed invention, including for example, Claims 10, 23, and 32. Applicant is also canceling Claims 42-44 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 17-18, 26, 27 and 35-41 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmann (US 4,976,515). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 1-3 to recite the feature of "wherein the liquid crystal material has an approximately V-shaped electrooptical characteristic."

Applicant respectfully submits that Hartmann fails to disclose or suggest a liquid crystal material having an approximately V-shaped electrooptical characteristic. Therefore, amended independent Claims 1-3 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by Hartmann but are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 7-9, 11, 14, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7-9, 11, 14, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann in view of Saishu (US 6,069,600).¹ This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 19 and 28

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6, 19 and 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 23 and 32

The Examiner also rejects Claims 10, 23 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann in view of Verhulst (US 6,069,604). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above

¹ In this rejection, at page 7 of the Final Rejection, the Examiner again refers to “Yang” but provides no citation with this name. If the Examiner is going to continue this rejection, it is respectfully requested that he provide the citation for this reference “Yang” and where in the reference is the teaching

for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Further, these claims recite a response time. Applicant still believes that neither of the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed response time.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 10, 17-18, 23, 26-27 and 32 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Nito et al. (US 5,214,523). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 1-3 to recite the features of “displaying a first black level by the liquid crystal material in a first period; applying a first voltage to the liquid crystal material for a first gradation display in a second period just after the first period; displaying a second black level by the liquid crystal material in a third period just after the second period; and applying a second voltage to the liquid crystal material for a second gradation display in a fourth period just after the second period.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Nito fails to disclose or suggest these claimed features. Therefore, amended independent Claims 1-3 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by Nito but are patentable thereover.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Nito fails to disclose or suggest the features of amended Claims 10, 23 and 32. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

the Examiner is relying upon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 12-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 12-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito in view of Yamamoto et al. (5,617,229) and Kogushi et al. (US 5,598,284). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claim 12 to recite the features of “applying a voltage of 0V to the liquid crystal material in a first period through a single thin film transistor of the plurality of thin film transistors; and performing a first gradation display in a second period through the single thin film transistor just after the first period, applying a voltage of 0V to the liquid crystal material in a third period through a single thin film transistor of said plurality of thin film transistors just after the second period; and performing a second gradation display in a fourth period through said single thin film transistor just after the third period.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Nito, Yamamoto and Kogushi fail to disclose or suggest these claimed features. Therefore, independent Claim 12 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by these references, even if combined, but are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13 and 15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 12, 13 and 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Kogushi. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, neither Hartman nor Kogushi disclose or suggest the features of amended independent Claim 12, and Claim 12 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9, 11, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7-9, 11, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito in view of Saishu. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 19 and 28

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6, 19 and 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

1449 Form

Applicant notes that the 1449 form attached to the Final Rejection is signed but not initialed

for each reference. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a 1449 form with each reference initialed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568